

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. No claims have been amended, cancelled, or added. Therefore, claims 7-9, 14, 18-21, and 23-27 are presented for examination.

Claims 7-9, 14, 18-21, 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,549) in view of Shiraishi et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0100621). Applicant submits that the present claims are patentable over Moss in view of Shiraishi.

As presently understood by the Applicant, Moss generally relates to computer modules with flat panel displays (FPDs), and particularly to liquid crystal display (LCD) modules installed in a peripheral device bay of a computer system. ([col. 1, ll. 6-9])

As presently understood by the Applicant, Shiraishi generally relates to a projection type image display mechanism and a projection type image display device for enlarging an image and projecting the image on a screen by utilizing a light valve element such as a LCD panel. (paragraph [0002])

Claim 7 recites:

An apparatus comprising:
a rack-mount server enclosure having a front face;
a display device mounted on the front face movably coupled to the enclosure for multiple degrees of freedom of movement for the display device; and
an adjustable screw **to lock** the display device at one of a plurality of positions.

(Emphasis Added)

In particular, claim 7 expressly recites “an adjustable screw **to lock** the display device at one of a plurality of positions.” The Examiner admits on page 3 of the Office action that

Moss fails to recite an adjustable screw. The Examiner continues by asserting that Shiraishi teaches an adjustable screw on page 7, paragraph 96. Shiraishi does appear to teach adjustable screws. However, the function is not **to lock** a display device at one of a plurality of positions as expressly recited in claim 7.

In paragraph 96 Shiraishi states that “if all adjusting screws 903a, 903b, and 903c are uniformly screwed, the reflection type LCD panel 91 **can be moved back and forth** with respect to the front plane...” (Emphasis Added) Moreover, Shiraishi consistently **teaches away** from the adjusting screws being used “**to lock** a display device at ***one of a plurality of positions***.” For example, again in paragraph 96 Shiraishi states “if the screwing amount of the adjusting screws 903a, 903b and 903c is different from each other, the reflection type LCD panel 91 **can be turned** in two predetermined direction [sic] with respect to the front plane 901a of the support base 901...” (Emphasis Added) (see also Fig. 17)

Simply, Shiraishi does not disclose, teach, or reasonably suggest “an adjustable screw ***to lock*** the display device ***at one of a plurality of positions***” as is expressly recited in claim 7. Instead, at least as presently understood by the Applicant, Shiraishi appears to teach adjustable screws for defining ranges of movement and not to lock a display device at one of a plurality of positions.

Consequently, claim 7 is distinguishable over the combination of Moss and Shiraishi. Since claims 8-9 and 25 properly depend from claim 7, they inherit all the limitations of the base claim and are distinguishable over Moss in view of Shiraishi for at least the reason given for claim 7.

Independent claims 14 and 18 also expressly recite “an adjustable screw ***to lock*** the display device at one of a plurality of positions.” As such, these claims and their dependent

claims, claims 19-21 and 23-24, and 26-27, are distinguishable over Moss in view of Shiraishi for at least the reason given for claim 7.

Claims 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moss et al. in view of Shiraishi et al. as applied to claims 7-9, 14, 18-24 above, and further in view of Iredale (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,877). Applicant submits that claims 25-27 are patentable over Moss and Shiraishi in view of Iredale.

As presently understood by the Applicant, Iredale generally relates to a laptop computer having an improved clamshell type housing that facilitates adjustment of the display screen to a comfortable viewing angle. ([col. 1, ll. 11-13]) Claims 25-27 depend from independent claims 7, 14 and 18 respectively, they inherit the limitations of the base claim from which they depend. However, the Applicant can find no teach of “an adjustable screw *to lock* the display device at one of a plurality of positions” in Iredale. As such, Iredale does not remedy the deficiency of Moss and Shiraishi and claims 25-27 are patentable for at least this reason.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



Date: August 10, 2006

Mark L. Watson
Reg. No. 46,322

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980